DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 608 CS 505 105

AUTHOR Spitzberg, Brian H.
TITLE Relational Competence: An Empirical Test of a Conceptual Model.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (32nd, Boston, MA, May 2-5, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Apprehension; *Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence; Knowledge Level; *Models; Motivation; Participant Satisfaction; Research Problems; *Social Environment

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to test a model of relational competence that consisted of three components: motivation, knowledge, and skill in interaction for both participants in a conversation. The model is based on the assumption that the additive combination of these components for both participants will be significantly predictive of several competent outcomes, including communication satisfaction, perceived confirmation, conversational appropriateness, and effectiveness. Subjects, approximately 500 college students, completed measures of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension (motivation), self-monitoring (knowledge), attentiveness, self-rated competence, and ratings of other competence (skill). The measures were completed before and after interaction in one of two dyadic situations--acquaintance and task. Results indicated that the context-independent measures did not contribute significant variance to the model. However, both the context-specific measures of skill contributed substantial amounts of variance in all of the predictions. The findings support the conclusion that competence is a contextual phenomenon and requires context-specific conceptualization and measurement. Appendices include statistical tables and a six-page list of references. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED264608

RELATIONAL COMPETENCE:

AN EMPIRICAL TEST OF A CONCEPTUAL MODEL

By

Brian H. Spitzberg

University of Southern California

Los Angeles, CA 90007

(213) 743-8969

ABSTRACT

A model of relational competence is reviewed, which consists of three components: motivation, knowledge, and skill in interaction for both participants in a conversation. The model assumes that the additive combination of these components for both interactants will be significantly predictive of competent outcomes; specifically, communication satisfaction, perceived confirmation, and conversational appropriateness and effectiveness. These constructs were operationalized by the measures of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension (motivation), self-monitoring (knowledge), attentiveness, self-rated competence, and rating of alter-competence (skill). A total of 492 subjects completed these measures before and after interaction in one of two dyadic situations: acquaintance and task. Results indicate that the context-independent measures did not contribute significant variance to the model. However, the context-specific measures of skill (i.e., self-rated and alter-competence) both contributed substantial amounts of variance in all of the predictions. Findings support the conclusion that competence is a contextual phenomenon, and requires context-specific conceptualization and measurement.

Paper presented to the International Communication Association Convention, Boston, Massachusetts, May 1982.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Brian H. Spitzberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505105

RATIONALE

Theory and research increasingly point to three basic components of individual competence: motivation, knowledge, and skill (Argyle, 1969; Clinard, 1979; Knapp, 1978; Spitzberg, 1981a; Thayer, 1968). An individual must know how to interact competently with particular individuals in specific contexts. Even knowing how to interact does not guarantee possession of the requisite skills for implementing that knowledge. And possessing both knowledge and ability to interact competently does not necessitate a desire to interact competently. To use a dramaturgical metaphor developed by Ring, Braginsky, and Braginsky (1966), an actor cannot perform competently if s/he is not motivated to perform. Further, being motivated to perform does not necessitate that the actor knows the script to perform. Finally, knowing the script and wanting to perform well do not guarantee that the actor is skilled in acting ability. A similar approach is taken by Powell (1979), who identifies three reasons why a person would interact incompetently:

> (1) the individual does not recognize the requirements of the situational form and, therefore, cannot adapt to it; (2) the individual recognizes the form, but chooses not to respond to it because the payoff is too low or the resistance too high; and (3) the individual recognizes the situational form, but does not have the necessary communication skills to respond appropriately (p. 141).

These reasons correspond to knowledge, motivation, and skill components of interaction.

Recently, Spitzberg (1981a) has refined this model. His conceptualization includes a dyadic interaction between A and B, in context C at time T. Within this context, individual competencies are comprised of context-specific and context-independent characteristics. Specifically, the components of motivation, knowledge, and skill are viewed as additive competencies in the prediction of criteria of competence in interaction. That is, as the additive combination of A's and B's motivations, knowledge reserviors, and skills in a given

interaction increases, so do the outcomes of communication satisfaction, perceived confirmation, and perceived conversational appropriateness and effectiveness.

Motivation is conceptualized as a function of approach and avoidance factors. Individuals characteristically tend to approach or avoid interactive contexts. The approach factor can be operationalized by the contstruct of communication involvement (Cegala, 1978). Interaction involvement refers to

> the general tendency for an individual to demonstrate both attentiveness and perceptiveness in interactions. As such, it is considered a fundamentally important cognitive dimension of communicative competence (Cegala, 1981, p. 112).

Interaction involvement represents a perceived tendency to engage and attend intentionally in conversations with particular sensitivity to self, alter, and the context. It has manifested small but statistically significant positive relationships with communicative competence control dimensions (Cegala, 1978; 1981). Therefore, communication invovlement reflects a motivational component involving a desire to approach communicative situations with perceptiveness, other-orientation, and attentiveness.

Whereas communication involvement reflects a proclivity to approach communicative contexts, communication apprehension represents an active avoidance and fear of communicative contexts. Communication apprehension is a predisposition to experience anxiety in communicative situations. Communication apprehensives perceive themselves as lonely, shy, withdrawn, communicatively inadequate, passive, unaffiliative, and interpersonally ineffective (Burgoon, 1976; Daly, 1978; McCroskey, 1977; McCroskey, Daly & Sorenson, 1976; McCroskey, Daly, Richmond & Falcione, 1977; McCroskey, Richmond, Daly & Cox, 1975; Phillips, 1968; Rosenfeld & Plax, 1976; Spitzberg, 1981b). There is substantial reason, then, to view communication apprehension as an avoidance factor of communication.

Persons motivated to approach interactive contexts may still lack the knowledge of potentially effective and appropriate behavior. Knowledge includes familiarity with communicative rules (linguistic, social, and interpersonal), scripts (internalized schemas for responding and recognizing conversational forms and patterns), personal information (interpersonal constructs and behavioral cues), contextual information (episodic, relational, and situational forms), and the interface of these factors. The proclivity to attend to these factors, compare them to current and past experiences, and assess the most appropriate and effective behavioral options available is operationalized in the construct of self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974). High self-monitors are very sensitive to contextual and communicative cues of appropriateness (Snyder, 1979a, 1979b). Research indicates that high self-monitors are "particularly knowledgeable about individuals who are prototypes of a wide variety of trait domains" (Snyder & Cantor, 1980, p. 222). That is, high self-monitors possess an extensive reservoir of knowledge about various personality types. To enhance this reservior, high self-monitors tend to be other-oriented by actively monitoring the actions of others in interaction (Brandt, Miller & Hocking, 1981; Brockner & Eckenrode, 1979; Ickes & Barnes, 1977; Rarick, Soldow & Geizer, 1976). Thus, self-monitoring reflects a tendency to acquire, possess, access, and use social information and knowledge.

Finally, the skill components of empathy (Lane, 1981; Spitzberg, 1980), role-taking ability (Hale, 1980; Hale & Delia, 1976), nonverbal expressiveness (Friedman, Prince, Riggio & DiMatteo, 1980), communication sensitivity (Neal & Hughey, 1979), and composite competence constructs (Bienvenu, 1971; Farber, 1962; Holland & Baird, 1968; Phelps & Snavely, 1980; Spitzberg 1981e) have all been identified as important measures of competence. In all, these research lines continue to indicate that "other-orientation" appropriately describes a vital skill of competence (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981; Feingold, 1977;

Spitzberg, 1981d). Other-orientation is manifested through attentiveness, interest in alter, and several behaviors such as positive feedback, supportiveness, respect, and politeness. The importance of attentiveness as an other-oriented style is emphasized by Norton and Pettegrew (1979): "The attentive communicator focuses his/her regard toward the other while simultaneously signaling verbally and paraverbally that interest, concern, sensitivity, and notice are being shown" (p. 26). Attentive communicators confirm alter's self-concept and enhance enjoyment of the interaction. In their research, Norton and Pettegrew found that 75 percent of the variance of "being a good communicator" was accounted for by communication attentiveness.

Another approach to communicative skill and other-orientation is that of Cupach and Spitzberg (1981). Their research indicates that competence is best assessed by alter, rather than self alone. That is, A's satisfaction is primarily due to A's perception of B's conversational competence. B's competence is operationalized by a set of self-reported other-oriented behaviors and conversational skills, as perceived by A. Behaviors and impressions included in this research are those perceived as "supportive," "cooperative," "polite," and "respectful" communication. Thus, other-oriented behavior appears to be an essential element of competent communication skill.

Finally, several outcomes are predicted as criteria of competent interaction. If individuals are competent in a given interaction, the episodic outcomes of perceived confirmation, communication satisfaction, and percieved conversational appropriateness and effectiveness should accrue. These three outcomes are central to competent communication. Competent communication is likely to be confirming of self-concepts rather than disconfirming (Cissna, 1976; Cissna & Keating, 1979; Sieburg, 1973; Sieburg & Larson, 1971; Wilmot, 1979), satisfying rather than dissatisfying (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b, 1978c, 1978d), and appropriate and effective rather than inappropriate and ineffective

(Spitzberg & Phelps, 1981).

The foregoing review of Spitzberg's (1981a) model indicates that there are three fundamental components of competence in communicating: motivation, knowledge, and skill. An individual needs to be motivated to interact competently, possess the knowledge of how to interact competently, and be capable of enacting (i.e., demonstrating) the behavioral requisites of competent communication. The competency of these components can be assessed by the degree to which they relate to the outcomes of perceived confirmation, communication satisfaction, and conversational appropriateness. Table 1 illustrates the operational components of this model, and provides a working vocabulary from which hypotheses can be derived.

insert Table 1 about here

HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The general competence model forecasts that motivation, knowledge, and skill will significantly predict outcomes of competence. Operationally, this results in the following hypotheses:

H_1: Communication satisfaction is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and relational competence measures.

H_2: Perceived confirmation is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and relational competence measures.

H_3: Conversational appropriateness and effectiveness is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and relational competence measures.

The overall competence model indicates that the components of motivation, knowledge, and skill will be significantly predictive of several competent outcomes. However, before the remaining hypotheses can be elaborated, a decision must be made regarding the optimal relational competence component to use

whether joint (i.e., additive) or interactive (i.e., multiplicative). Thus, the following research question is posed:

Q_1: Which combination of competence variables, joint or interactive, is the optimal predictor of competence outcomes?

Given that either joint or interactive relational competence will be a better predictor, the relational competence model indicates that competence components will not only predict self-rated outcomes, but alter's outcomes as well. That is, A's competence predicts B's satisfaction, confirmation, and perceived conversational appropriateness and effectiveness.

H_4: Alter's communication satisfaction is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and (joint or interactive) relational competence measures.

H_5: Alter's perceived confirmation is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and (joint or interactive) relational competence measures.

H_6: Alter's conversational appropriateness and effectiveness is significantly predicted by a linear combination of communicatin involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension, self-monitoring, communication attentiveness, and (joint or interactive) relational competence measures.

In addition to these hypotheses, an important question to be answered concerns the nature of the relationship between self-rated and alter-rated competence. Specifically, past research has revealed only a moderate relationship between self and alter ratings of competence for recalled conversations (Cupach, 1981; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1981). The question remains however, whether or not these correlations were affected by the conversations being remembered rather than rated immediately following their occurrence (see Hecht, 1978b). It is possible that having the stimulus conversation immediately prior to measurement may result in a closer consensus between partners regarding each other's competence. The question is important inasmuch as self-report measures of competence are widely used, despite a lack of validity evidence. By relating self- and other-rated competence, a preliminary

assessment of self-reported competence measures can be obtained. Thus, the following research question will be explored:

Q_2: What is the relationship between self-rated and other-competence?

Finally, despite the numerous hypothesized relationships among the variables, the relationships between the sets of variables (i.e., predictor components and outcomes) are uncertain. That is, relations within the component and outcome sets may affect and be affected by relations between the sets. Thus, it is important to explore the possible relationships between the components of competence and the outcomes of competence.

Q_3: What is the relationship between the competence components and competence outcomes?

METHOD

Subjects

Participants were 606 students in communication classes at two large western Universities, one public (n=80) and one private (n=526). Samples were combined for statistical analyses. Approximately 95 percent were between the ages of 16 and 24 years old. More than half of the sample was female (66 percent). Due to attendance fluctuations between time one and time two questionnaire administrations (for approximately half of the sample that was in the two-session procedure), the original pool of subjects was reduced to between 250 and 350 for most statistical analyses because of incomplete questionnaire completion for at least one member of a dyad.

Procedures

Student volunteers were solicited in 30 different classes. Oral instructions briefly stated that it was a dissertation study of conversational communication, requiring that they be paired with a partner whom they may or may not know in order that they could carry on a conversation. There were two different conditions: acquaintance (reduced sample n=173) and task (reduced sample n=112). In the acquaintance condition, subjects were asked to get to

get to know each other better. In the task situation, subjects were asked to make prediscussion ratings of problem-solution options on the moon-explorer task, carry on a discussion to attain consensual ratings, and then complete the post-discussion ratings.

For approximately the second half of the sample (n=298), a single-session administration was used, in which the context-independent questionnaire packet was administered immediately prior to the discussion and ratings. This was done because preliminary returns from the two-session procedure indicated that only about 50 percent of the dyads could be retained for analysis due to attendance fluctuations between time-one and time-two administrations (resulting in incomplete data sets for at least one member of a dyad). Although administering three questionnaire packets at one time risked respondent fatigue, the administrations were separated by a 10-12 minute conversation. Therefore, the risk was deemed necessary to maintain sample size.

For the first 308 subjects (98 task, 210 acquaintance), a two-session administration was utilized in which the context-independent packet was administered two weeks after the conversational exercise and the context-specific questionnaire administration.

In the single-session administration, after participants completed the first questionnaire (i.e., the context-independent measures), they were systematically paired with partners on the basis of seating arrangement. Students were generally paired with a partner sitting behind her/him. It was assumed that close friends would be more likely to sit side-by-side than back-to-front in classroom rows. In the two-session administration, participants were paired on the basis of identification numbers on their packets. These systematic variation procedures were performed so as to minimize biased inflation of outcome measures due to a priori partner preferences and subsequent selection.

Once seated with their conversational partners, participants were instructed by the experimenter to begin discussion once they had read the instructions on the questionnaire cover sheets. In both conditions, the conversations were ended by the experimenter after 10-12 minutes had elapsed.

Instruments

All instruments were chosen on the basis of three criteria, in the following order of importance: isomorphism with the proposed competence construct, prior validity support, and prior acceptable reliabilities. All instruments were adapted in format to enhance consistency and convenience for the participants. The scale for all instruments (except CAE, which is a semantic differential) is a 5-point Likert-type response format as follows: 1=Strongly Agree; 2=Mildly Agree; 3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Undecided; 4=Mildly Disagree; and 5=Strongly Disagree. Factor analysis results are available upon request of the author. The instruments can be divided into two types: context-specific and context-independent.

Context-Specific Instruments

Acquaintance Condition (ACQ). There were two conditions in this research. One was essentially a "get acquainted" exercise. In order to obtain a general manipulation check, participants were asked to rate several aspects of their relationship status, knowledge of alter before and after the conversation, typicality of the conversation, and attraction to alter before and after the conversation. In no instance was any person paired with an alter rated as more intimate than a close friend. The average amount of change in knowledge of the other person was 2.83 out of a possible scale of eight (most change) anchored by "not at all" and "very well." On a scale of nine (very typical), the rating of the typicality of the conversation averaged 6.71.

Compliance To Alter (CTA). This measure is simply a total of the number of items changed between pre- and post-discussion rankings in the moon-explorer

task. Participants were asked to rate the hypothetical importance of various items required to reach a mother ship 200 miles away from their wrecked moon ship. After their initial ratings, dyads discussed their ratings in order to achieve as much consensus as possible in the time allotted. Compliance to alter is the amount of change between pre- and post-discussion ratings. It provides a general measure of task involvement and effectiveness of alter in changing self-ratings due to alter and conversational influences. On a scale of zero to 15, the average change was 10.48.

Rating of Alter Competence (RAC). This is a 24-item instrument developed by Cupach and Spitzberg (1981). It references the rater's perception of alter's competence in a specific conversation. It has manifested a strong relationship to communication satisfaction for recalled conversations (R = .50, Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981) and has differentiated self-reported prosocial behavior in conflict situations from destructive behavior (Cupach, 1981). Its coefficient alpha reliability was .93 in this sample (n=458).

Self-Rated Competence (SRC). This is the second measure constructed in the Cupach and Spitzberg (1981) study of relational competence. It is a 25-item instrument referring to how competent the rater perceives her/himself to have been in a specific conversation. It correlates moderately with rating of alter competence (r = .60) and communication satisfaction (r = .42) (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981). Its coefficient alpha reliability was .92 in this study (n=458).

Perceived Confirmation (CON). Originally constructed as a compliment to an observational measure, this six-item instrument was designed to assess the general impression of a person having been confirmed in conversation (Cissna, 1976). It taps awareness, interest, respect, acceptance, liking, and trust (each an item). It was adapted to the format of the RAC instrument (i.e., referring to one's conversational partner as "s/he") and appended to the RAC.

Its coefficient alpha reliability in this study was .82 (n=458).

Communication Satisfaction (SAT). Communication satisfaction is a 19-item measure reflecting an individual's perception of reinforcement of positive expectations in a conversation. It has been shown to be related empirically and conceptually to aspects of effective and competent communication (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b, 1978c, 1978d; Spitzberg, 1981e). Coefficient alpha reliability for SAT was .91 in this study (n=458).

Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness (CAE). This instrument was constructed expressly for this study. It consists of 26 counter-balanced semantic differential scale items. Adjectives reflect two semantic domains: appropriateness and effectiveness (each 13 items). Conceptually, it was expected that the appropriateness and effectiveness outcomes would be separate, but highly correlated, factors of competent impression management. In order to assess the factor properties of the scale, two procedures were undertaken. First, exploratory factor analysis was performed. This was done to eliminate extraeous or insignificant items from further analysis. Criteria for assessing the number of factors to rotate based on direct solutions were: (1) eigenvalues of unrotated factors greater than one, and (2) Cattell's scree procedure (Cattell & Vogelmann, 1977). After rotation, a factor was considered defined if two or more items loaded at .50 or greater with no secondary loading greater than .30. Using these criteria, two factors did emerge, although only two items defined the second factor. Since one intent of this research was to construct a convenient instrument for assessing appropriateness and effectiveness, the item total was reduced to 16 items. On the basis of exploratory analysis, items were excluded on the basis of (1) lack of any primary loading abouve .50, (2) lower loadings than remaining items, and (3) the comments received from subjects regarding the interpretability of the items (e.g., numerous respondents inquired as to the meaning of the term "seemly"). The two

factors were highly correlated (r = .70), and the first factor accounted for 93 percent of the variance of the two. Results of the exploratory factor analysis are displayed in Table 2.

Second, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed to assess the best interpretation of the CAE. Confirmatory factor analysis tests the goodness of fit between the actual interitem correlation matrix and a predicted correlation matrix (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1978; Kim & Mueller, 1978). It is rare that hypothesized and predicted correlation matrices are not significantly different (given the power of a large sample). Nevertheless, confirmatory factor analysis allows alternatively possible hypothesized models to be tested. Specifically, differing factor structures can be predicted and compared in order to derive the most meaningful and/or statistically significant model. Thus, three models were proposed: a one general factor model, a two specific factor model (the expected appropriateness and effectiveness factors), and a three factor model with one general and two specific factors. The best fitting model is the one with the largest chi-square-to-degrees of freedom ratio.

The results can be seen in Table 3. Of the three models, the three factor model (one general, two specific) provides the best fit (x^2 = 215.82, df = 87). However, given the high intercorrelation of the factors in the two-factor hypothesized model (r = .90), and the high primary loadings of the items on the general factor of the three factor model, the CAE appears to be most easily and meaningfully interpreted as a unidimensional measure. In other words, in all models, one general factor containing both appropriateness and effectiveness items appears to be the strongest factor; hence a unidimensional interpretation seems justified.

The 16-item CAE scale was used to operationally define the general perception of the conversation's appropriateness and effectiveness in this study. Its coefficient alpha reliability was .93 (n=475).

Context-Independent Instruments

Communication Involvement (CIN). The CIN is an 18-item instrument developed by Cegala (1978, 1981). It represents a perceived proclivity to be perceptive, other-oriented, and responsive in conversational encounters; thus operationalizing a perceived motivation to be enmeshed in interaction and other-oriented toward alters in conversation. Its coefficient alpha reliability was .84 in this study (n=477).

Interpersonal Communication Apprehension (ICA). An enormous amount of research has been performed on communication apprehension using McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (McCroskey, 1977). Repeated debate regarding its factor structure and contextual predictiveness (Beatty, Behnke & McCallum, 1978; Daly, 1978, 1980; Porter, 1979; Siebold & McPhee, 1980) motivated the construction of a new four-factor measure tapping organizational, group, public, and interpersonal contexts (McCroskey, Note 1). The ICA is composed of the six items used to assess the interpersonal context. Its scoring was reversed for this study (i.e., higher scores indicate lower apprehension). The ICA operationalizes an anticipated anxiety in interpersonal communication, and therefore reflects a communication avoidance response. Its coefficient alpha reliability was .86 in this research (n=477).

Communication Attentiveness (ATT). Attentiveness is a 24-item instrument that assesses self-reported tendencies to listen to, attend to, empathize with, encourage, and provide observable feedback cues to alters in conversational encounters (Norton & Pettegrew, 1979). Its coefficient alpha reliability in this study was .84 (n=.477).

Self-Monitoring (SMN). Snyder's (1974, 1979a) 25-item instrument has been conceptually and empirically related to numerous facets of interaction that could be considered competent (Dabbs, Evans & Hopper, 1980; Ickes & Barnes, 1977; Snyder, 1974, 1979a, 1979b, 1980; Snyder & Swann, 1976;

Snyder & Tanke, 1976; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1981; Tunnell, 1980; Zanna, Olsen & Fazio, 1980). Specifically, the self-monitoring measure assesses an individual's perceived proclivity to attend to the social, contextual, and interactive cues in order to inform her/his choice of appropriate and effective behavioral adaptation. Its coefficient alpha reliability in this study was unimpressive (.67, n=477), but acceptable for research purposes.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

The intercorrelation matrix of all individual variables is presented in Table 4. Before analyzing the research questions and hypotheses, several analyses were performed to assess possible differences between sex of respondent, sex of alter, and condition (i.e., task or acquaintance). A series of one-way analyses of variance were performed with three factors treated as independent variables with each of the competence variables and outcomes treated as dependent variables. To protect from experiment-wise error rates, results were considered significant only at the .01 level. Rating of alter-competence ($F = 9.97$, $df = 1,346$, $p<.01$), self-rated competence ($F = 21.30$, $df = 1,346$, $p<.01$), attentiveness ($F = 8.04$, $df = 1,346$, $p<.01$), perceived confirmation ($F = 10.50$, $df = 1,346$, $p<.01$), and conversational appropriateness and effectiveness ($F = 8.79$, $df = 1,346$, $p<.01$) were all significantly different between males and females, with females always rating higher. In no instance did sex of alter result in a significant difference. This means that subjects were not significantly more satisfied, confirmed, or perceiving of appropriateness and effectiveness due to the sex of their conversational partners. It appears that there is a fairly consistent tendency for females to rate themselves higher on competence and competence outcomes than males. However, this difference is apparently not communicated reliably to conversational partners, since such differences would result in higher ratings for female partners. The practical

meaning of these sex differences is difficult to ascertain. The magnitude of difference in each contrast is relatively small. To assess the effect of the sex differences, self sex was dummy coded and entered first in the multiple regression analyses for tests of hypotheses one through three.

Surprisingly, there were no significant differences between task and acquaintance conditions for any of the measures. The situations were originally chosen for their differences in the types of information likely to be exchanged and the subjective processes they would elicit. The task situation was assumed to tap the effectiveness outcome more than appropriateness, and the inverse was expected for the acquaintance condition. However, given no differences between the conditions, the two subsamples were combined for all remaining analyses.

Finally, scatterplots of all bivariate component and outcome relationships were examined to assess the hypothesized linearity of the relationships. In no instance was a distiactly curvilinear relationship apparent.

Hypotheses One Through Three

Hypotheses one, two and three were tested by stepwise multiple regression analysis after sex was entered first. Hypothesis one was supported (Table 5), with the competence components explaining 64 percent of the variance in communication satisfaction ($R = .80$, $p<.05$). However, only RAC and SRC contributed significant amounts of variance, according to the stepwise F-ratios.

Hypothesis two was also supported (Table 6), with 68 percent of the perceived confirmation variance explained by the competence components ($R = .82$, $p<.05$). Only RAC and SRC contributed significant amounts of variance to the prediction of perceived confirmation.

Hypothesis three was supported as well (Table 7), with 41 percent of the variance of conversational appropriateness and effectiveness explained by the competence components ($R = .64$, $p<.05$). Again, only RAC and SRC were

statistically significant predictors. Thus, while all the results are supportive of the skill components of self-rated and other-competence, none of the results are supportive of the entire model. Gender was not a statistically significant unique predictor when combined with the other components.

Research Question One

Research question one was tested by creating four variables: A's relational competence (ARC), B's relational competence (BRC), interactive relational competence (ARC+BRC = IRC), and joint relational competence (ARC+BRC = JRC). JRC correlated with IRC at .9966, indicating that there is no distinguishable difference between the two variables. In addition, average relative percentage contribution of the three variables was assessed by a procedure suggested by Lindeman, Merenda and Gold (1980, pp. 126-127). Essentially, the process involves designing a series of regression statements such that the predictors are entered into the equation in all possible order permutations. By averaging the unique variance contributed by each predictor across all order permutations, a relatively accurate estimate of relative importance of the predictors is obtained. In this instance, JRC fairly consistently averaged approximately one percent greater than IRC in predicting both self and alter outcomes (Table 8). In answer to research question one, then, additive combinations of competence variables appear to be potentially preferable to multiplicative combinations, although neither manifests obvious superiority in predicting outcomes in this study. Consequently, JRC will be used in testing the remaining hypotheses.

Hypotheses Four Through Six

Hypotheses four, five, and six were tested by entering all competence predictors except SRC and RAC into multiple regression equations to predict alter outcomes. Instead of SRC and RAC, JRC was used as the context-specific measure of skill. Stepwise regressions were performed for each of the three

outcomes, alter-satisfaction (ASAT), alter-confirmation (ACON), and alter-conversational appropriateness and effectiveness (ACAE).

Hypothesis four was supported (Table 9), with the components explaining 45 percent of the variance in ASAT ($R = .67$, $p<.05$). JRC was the only statistically significant predictor.

Hypothesis five was supported (Table 10), with 46 percent of the variance of ACON explained by the competence components ($R = .76$, $p<.05$). In this instance, both JRC and self-monitoring added statistically significant information to the prediction equation. However, because the SMN beta is negative, it may be an artifact. Self-monitoring is conceptually and empirically positively related to competence in most instances (see Table 4).

Hypothesis six was supported (Table 11), with 31 percent of CAE variance predicted by the components ($R = .56$, $p<.05$). Once more, JRC was the only statistically significant predictor. Thus, although substantial amounts of variance in alter outcomes is explained in each instance, only the joint relational competence variables contributes statistically significant information to the model.

Research Question Two

Research question two concerns the relationship between self-rated and other-rated competence measures. That is, what is the relationship between A's estimate of A's competence and B's perception of A's competence in a given time and context? As can be seen in Table 4, SRC has a zero-order correlation of .32 with ARAC, which is statistically significant ($p<.01$). Although statistically significant, the relationship is actually small in terms of the amount of variance explained (approximately eight percent). It would appear that self perceptions of competence may bear only small relationships with other's perceptions of self's competence.

Research Question Three

Research question three regards the relationships between the sets of competence components and outcomes. It was explored via canonical correlation analysis. Two canonical correlations were assessed. In the first (Table 12), the component set of RAC,SRC,CIN,SMN,ATT, and ICA were related to the outcome set of SAT, CON, AND CAE. Only one canonical root was statistically significant, with 76 percent of the variance shared between the sets of variables (R_C=.88, p<.01). Examination of the canonical variate weights suggests that rating of alter-competence is weighted in correspondence with perceived confirmation. This is in concert with many of the other relationships found, and is expected from the zero-order correlation between these two variables (r=.79). Further interpretation however, should await the analysis of the variate loadings (Levine, 1977; Tucker & Chase, 1980).

The next canonical correlation was constructed to assess the relationship between the same component sets as in the first, with the addition of alter's outcomes, ARAC, ACON, ACAE. The intent was to examine the optimal set of predictors of alter's impressions of conversational satisfaction, etc. Three canonical roots were extracted, the first of which mirrors the root found in the first canonical correlation. Rating of alter-competence and perceived confirmation appear to correspond considerably. In the second root, rating of alter-competence corresponds with alter's confirmation in the conversation, and self-rated competence appears to be similarly weighted as alter's communication satisfaction. In the third root, self-monitoring shows a high positive weight along with self's conversational appropriateness and alter's conversational appropriateness and effectiveness. In total, 77 percent of the variance is shared between the two sets of variables; a mere one percent difference by adding alter's outcomes. Thus, as in the

hypothesis tests, two tentative conclusions can be derived from the canonical results. First, it appears that the trait variables simply do not contribute a substantial amount of variance to the overall model of relational competence. Second, as in the hypothesis tests, rating of alter-competence is clearly the strongest predictor of outcomes, even apparently alter's outcomes. Apparently, A's perception of B's competence is the best predictor (in this study) of A's own outcomes. It is even A's best predictor of B's outcomes!

DISCUSSION

The results are at once, promising and discouraging. The hypotheses are all partially supported, and a substantial amount of variance in self and alter outcomes is explained in most instances. The disconcerting result is that none of the context-independent variables contributed substantial amounts of variance to the predictions. Even the context-specific measure of self-rated competence did not perform well relative to the rating of alter-competence measure. If this is to be accepted as a valid finding, then the viability of self-referenced competence measures may be seriously suspect.

These results must be examined in light of the possibility that there may be atifactual correlation between the measures due to intrapacket location. The highest correlations exist among measures within the questionnaire packets. While there is likely to be some such method variance, it appears incontrovertible now, that after this, and three other studies of relational competence, the most substantial relationships have been consistently found only among conversation-specific measures and relational competence measures (Cupach,1981; Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1981). This pattern indicates that competence is a context-bound phenomenon, which requires context-specific operationalization.

A second important finding is that the relational model is not strongly

supported by the results. Specifically, inasmuch as motivation and knowledge are operationalized by trait measures, these components do not contribute substantial amounts of information in predicting relational competence outcomes. Five possible interpretations appear plausible. The first very probable explanation has already been examined. Trait measures simply may not predict behavior within the dynamics of a specific situation.

Second, the situation may have been atypical for students, despite their rating on typicality. That is, the stimulus situation may have placed the subjects in an unusual position, one that does not tap their requisite knowledge and motivation. Since the exercise appeared as a consensual task (i.e., one that compeled cooperation as a classroom assignment), motivation may have been constant. Further, because the moon-explorer exercise requires mainly technical knowledge, and acquaintance discussion requires self-knowledge, the knowledge component may have been relatively constant. Thus, the stimulus situation may not have allowed the full impact of knowledge and motivation to affect the conversations. This interpretation appears unlikely because the processes of self-monitoring, communication involvement, and communication apprehension ought to be operating regardless of the content knowledge required.

Third, the measures may not possess adequate construct validity. Attentiveness, communication involvement, and interpersonal communication apprehension have considerable self-report validity, yet minimal experimental or behavioral validation. Self-monitoring had considerable behavioral validity evidence, but usually is assessed with median splits to attain extreme differences. It is possible that these measures simply do not effectively tap their respective construct domains. This interpretation also seems unlikely, simply due to the consistency of findings associated with these constructs. Fourth, the trait measures may just insufficiently tap the conceptual domains

proffered by the model. There may be minimal isomorphism between self-monitoring and knowledge of competent interaction behavior, communication involvement and apprehension with motivation to interact, and attentiveness with competence skills. If this is the case, instruments would need to be constructed to better measure knowledge and motivation aspects of competent interaction.

Fifth, the model itself may be inaccurate. Despite the intuitive appeal of the motivation, knowledge, and skill model, it may be too simplistic to predict to specific situations. For example, an acquaintance situation may be so scripted as to require minimal self-monitoring of the cues. further, motivation may be unnecessary if one's conversational skills are competent enough to be enacted with minimal effort. If this interpretation is reasonable, then the components may be more independent than expected, rendering the model far less predictive than intended. This will be discussed in greater detail in the section on theoretical implications.

Measurement Implications

Despite the problematic nature of the results for the model, the findings do support the "relational competence" measurement approach, and the rating of alter-competence measure specifically. Not only is RAC significantly predictive of all three outcome variables (self-satisfaction, perceived confirmation, and conversational appropriateness and effectiveness), its additive and multiplicative combination with self-rated competence also explained substantial amounts of alter-outcome variance.

One of the original assumptions underlying the construction of the measure of relational competence was that competence is relationally contextualized. In other words, standards of appropriateness and effectiveness vary by the interpersonal relationship of the interactants. The relational history of a dyad allows an idiosyncratic evolution of standards for competent behavior.

It was further assumed that self-report of competence alone is an insufficient indicant of competence. Relationally competent behavior must meet the standards of both relational participants. Hence, neither self-rated nor third party observation of competnece is likely to provide a comprehensive or sufficient assessment of relationally competent interaction by themselves. In fact, the rating of alter-competence was by far the strongest variable in this study. Self-rating of competence contributed significant unique variance, but it did not contribute large amounts of variance. Thus, both participants do need to be referenced in the measurement process, and it is the conversational alter that is most important in this measurement model.

Additionally, several context-specific measures exist that could provide excellent constructs for future research into relational competence. For example, Levenson and Gottman (1978) developed a self-report measure of social competence in dating and assertion situations which reveals good predictive and criterion related validity. Sanson-Fisher and Mulligan (1977) found support for the behavioral validity of a self-report measure of appropriate and inappropriate classroom behavior. Morganstern and Wheeless (1980) constructed measures of relational anxiety, relational nonverbal anxiety, and relational status/self-control. Such measures reflect communication constructs as perceived by the participants in a specific encounter and/or relationship with another. Similarly knowledge and motivation measures could be designed that are situation/relationship specific. This is the necessary next step in the attempt to develop, validate, or invalidate the model of relational competence.

Theoretical Implications

How do the findings of this study fit into a theory of relationally competent communication? Three major implications of the findings can be derived. The first concerns the utility of traits as explanatory variables in a theory of relational competence. Consistently, trait variables have shown

small to moderate relation to measures of relational competence and competence outcomes. It appears that traits are not the optimal constructs for explaining social behavior (Argyle & Little, 1972). This is not to suggest that competence necessarily be viewed as a stochastic process. Indeed, the motivation, knowledge, and skill approach may still provide a useful model. But the constructs of motivation and knowledge must be recast at the relational level. To what extent does A want to communicate with B in Context C at Time T? How knowledgeable is A about B generally, and about B's experiences and proclivities in relation to the topic and context which involves them specifically? Conceptual and operational advancement of these components will significantly enhance the precision of the model.

The second implication of this study regards the utility of the model relative to other approaches. The motivation, knowledge, skills, and outcomes perspective is certainly only one perspective among many. Alternative conceptualizations might ve developed from the functional perspective of Bennis, Berlew, Schein and Steele (1973), the behavioral approach of Gottman (1979), the skills approach of Argyle (1969/1973), or the rules approach of Pearce (1976) and Pearce and Cronen (1980). Furthering each of these perspectives is likely to derive unique theoretic propositions and measurement possibilities. Consequently, other models need to be elaborated and empirically tested.

There is also a need to develop inductive or grounded theories of competence to compliment or qualify deductive models such as the one presented here. Considerable research has been done in the social skills literature to inform a theorist interested in constructing a pool of "competent behaviors." This pool could be enlarged, diversified, and varied experimentally by contexts and raters in order to assess what behaviors are consistently perceived as competent. These behaviors could then be compared to extant theoretic expectations and used to refine or redirect our current conceptualizations.

Finally, perhaps the most obvious direction for an inductive theory to begin is to examine behaviors that can be considered other-oriented. Without exception, in both recalled and immediate conversational stimuli, the rating of alter-competence has been the optimal predictor of competent outcomes. This is a theoretically significant finding. Although A's perception of A's own competence provides useful information in explaining A's satisfaction, confirmation, and perceptions of appropriateness and effectiveness, A's percpetion of alter's competence is far more important. This finding supports a considerable amount of research which indicates that other-oriented behavior is conversationally competent (e.g., Fiengold, 1977; Kupke, Calhoun & Hobbs, 1979; Kupke, Hobbs & Cheney, 1979; Dow, Glaser & Biglan, 1980). It is the other person who largely determines self feelings and perceptions of the conversation. Hence, other-orientation appears to be a vital behavioral component of competent communication, perhaps more important than any other. Both the regression analyses and the canonical correlations support the importance of the RAC. It manifests excellent reliability an displays similar characteristics for both recalled and immediate conversations. Overall, the rating of alter-competence appears to provide an excellent tool for advancing future research in the area of other-orientation specifically, and the area of competence in communicating generally. For example, the RAC could be related to numerous microscopic interactive behaviors to determine whether other-orientation is composed of context-independent or context-dependent behaviors. Another important direction for research is the extent to which other-orientation can be trained or taught. Educational and therapeutic uses of such training methods could be numerous and invaluable. Of course, these are empirical questions that need to be investigated. Nevertheless, the results of this study evidence considerable support for the RAC directly, and the consruct of other-orientation indirectly. Both deserve continued study.

SUMMARY

A model of relational competence was reviewed and summarized. Relational competence is construed as consisting of each individual's motivation to interact competently, knowledge of effective and appropriate behaviors, and skill in enacting such motivations and knowledge. If both participants are additively competent, then certain outcomes are likely to result, including perceived confirmation, perceptions of conversational appropriateness and effectiveness, and communication satisfaction. The model was operationalized through the measures of communication involvement, interpersonal communication apprehension (motivation), self-monitoring (knowledge), attentiveness, self-rated competence, and rating of alter-competence (skill). A total of 492 interacted in dyads in either a task or acquaintance condition. Prior to and following the interaction, subjects responded to several instruments; 244 subjects completed all measures within dyads. Results revealed that 64 percent of self communication satisfaction, 66 percent of perceived confirmation, and 45 percent of conversational appropriateness and effectiveness were explained by self competence components. Also, 45 percent of alter's satisfaction and perceived confirmation, and 31 percent of alter's conversational appropriateness and effectiveness were explained by the competence components when including a relational skill measure. Canonical correlation results corroborated these results. All of the analyses indicated that the measrues of motivation and knowledge did not contribute significant amounts of variance to the model. Thus, although the context-specific measures of skill appear to have strong predictive potential, the overall model of relational competence appears to require conceptual and empirical refinement. Most importantly, context-specific measures of knowledge and motivation need to be developed.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. The new apprehension scale was sent upon personal request of J.C. McCroskey, West Virginia University, Morgantown, Virginia, 26506.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. Social interaction. London: Tavistock, 1969 (rpt. 1973).

Argyle, M., & Little, B.R. Do personality traits apply to social behaviour? Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 1972, 2(1), 1-33.

Beatty, M.J., Behnke, R.R., & McCallum, K. Situational determinants of communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45(3), 187-191.

Bennis, W.G., Berlew, D.E., Schein, E.H., & Steele, F.I. Toward better interpersonal relationships. In W.G. Bennis, E.H. Schein, F.I. Steele, & D.E. Berlew (Eds.), Interpersonal dynamics: Essays and readings on human interaction. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1968, 495-518.

Bienvenu, M.J., Sr. An interpersonal communication inventory. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21(4), 381-388.

Brandt, D.R., Miller, G.R., & Hocking, J.E. Effects of self-monitoring and familiarity on deception detection. Communication Quarterly, 1980, 28(3), 3-10.

Brockner, J., & Eckenrode, J. Self-monitoring and the actor-observer bias. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1978, 9(2), 81-88.

Burgoon, J.K. The unwillingness-to-communicate scale: Development and validation. Communication Monographs, 1976, 43(1), 60-69.

Cattell, R.B., & Vogelmann, S. A comprehensive trial of the scree and KG criteria for determining the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1977, 12(3), 289-326.

Cegala, D.J. Interaction invovlement: A cognitive dimension of communication competence. Communication Education, 1981, 30(2), 109-121.

Cegala, D.J. Interaction involvement: A fundamental dimension of interpersonal communication competence. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1978.

Cissna, K.N. Interpersonal confirmation: A review of current theory, measurement and research. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1976.

Cissna, K.N., & Keating, S., Sr. Speech communication antecedents of perceived confirmation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1979, 43(1), 48-60.

Clinard, H. Interpersonal communication skills training. Training and Development Journal, 1979, 33(8), 34-38.

Cupach, W.R. The relationship between perceived communication competence and choice of interpersonal conflict message strategies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1981.

Cupach, W.R., & Spitzberg, B.H. Relational competence: Measurement and validation. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 1981.

Dabbs, J.M., Jr., Evans, M.S., Hopper, C.H., & Purvis, J.A. Self-monitors in conversation: What do they monitor? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 278-284.

Daly, J.A. The assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self-reports: A comparison of measures. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45(3), 204-218.

Daly, J.A. A response to Seibold and McPhee's reanalysis. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47(2), 153-154.

Dow, M.G., Glaser, S.R., & Biglan, A. The relevance of specific conversational behaviors to ratings of social skill: A review and experimental analysis. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New York, November 1980.

Farber, B. Elements of competence in interpersonal relations: A factor analysis. Sociometry, 1962, 25(1), 30-47.

Feingold, P.C. Toward a paradigm of effective communication: An empirical study of perceived communication effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37(8), 4697A-4698A.

Friedman, H.S., Prince, L.M., Riggio, R.E., & DiMatteo, M.R. Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The affective communication test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 333-351.

Gottman, J.M. Marital interaction: Experimental investigations. New York: Academic, 1979.

Hale, C.L. Cognitive complexity-simplicity as a determinant of communication effectiveness. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47(4), 304-311.

Hale, C.L., & Delia, J.G. Cognitive complexity and social perspective-taking. Communication Monographs, 1976, 43(3), 196-203.

Hecht, M.L. The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(3), 253-264. (a)

Hecht, M.L. Contextual correlates of communication satisfaction. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convnetion, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1978. (b)

Hecht, M.L. Measures of communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(4), 350-368. (c)

Hecht, M.L. Toward a conceptualization of communication satisfaction. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1978, 64(1), 47-62. (d)

Holland, J.L., & Baird, L.L. An interpersonal competency scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 503-510.

Ickes, W., & Barnes, R.D. The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35(5), 315-330.

Jöreskog, K.G., & Sörbom, D. LISREL IV: Analysis of linear structural relationships by the method of maximum liklihood. Chicago, Illinois: National Educational Resources, 1978.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C.W. Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1978.

Knapp, M.L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Kupke, T.E., Calhoun, K.S., & Hobbs, S.A. Selection of heterosocial skills: II. Experimental validity. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10(3), 336-346.

Kupke, T.E., Hobbs, S.A., & Cheney, T.H. Selection of heterosocial skills: I. Criterion-related validity. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10(3), 327-235.

Lane, S.D. Empathy and assertive communication. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 1981.

Levenson, R.W., & Gottman, J.M. Toward the assessment of social competence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46(3), 453-462.

Levine, M.S. Canonical analysis and factor comparison. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1977.

Lindeman, R.H., Merenda, P.F., and Gold, R.Z. Introduction to bivariate and multivariate analysis. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1980.

McCroskey, J.C. Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 4(1), 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C., Daly, J.A., & Sorensen, G. Personality correlates of communication apprehension: A research note. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2(4), 376-380.

McCroskey, J.C. Daly, J.A., Richmond, V.P., & Falcione, R.L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 2(4), 376-380.

McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., Daly, J.A., & Cox, B.G. The effects of communication apprehension on interpersonal attraction. Human Communication Research, 1975, 2(1), 51-65.

Morganstern, B.F., & Wheelis, L.R. The relationship of nonverbal anxiety, status/self-control and affective behaviors to relational anxiety. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convnetion, New York, November 1980.

Neal, W.P., & Hughey, J.D. Personality correlates of communication sensitivity and general sensitivity. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, Texas, November 1979.

Norton, R.W., & Pettegrew, L.S. Attentiveness as a style of communication: A structural analysis. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46(1), 13-26.

Pearce, W.B. An overview of communication and interpersonal relationships. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, 1976.

Pearce, W.B., & Cronen, V.E. Communication, action, and meaning. New York: Praeger, 1980, 185-230.

Phelps, L.A., & Snavely, W.B. Toward the measurement of interpersonal communication competence. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, February 1980.

Phillips, G.M. Reticence: Pathology of the normal speaker. Speech Monographs, 1968, 35(1), 39-49.

Porter, D.T. Communication apprehension: Communication's latest artifact? In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook (Vol. 3). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1979, 241-259.

Powell, R.G. Differentiating amoung social situations: An investigation of the role of the situational element in communication competency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1979.

Rarick, D.L., Soldow, G.F., & Geizer, R.S. Self-monitoring as a mediator of conformity. Central States Speech Journal, 1976, 27(4), 267-271.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., & Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal relations: A typology. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18(1), 203-220.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., Levine, L., & Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal behavior: An experimental validation of a typology. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1967, 3(2), 140-159.

Ring, K., & Wallston, K. A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22(1), 147-154.

Rosenfeld, L.B., & Plax, T.G. Perosnality discriminants of reticence. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1976, 40(1), 22-31.

Sanson-Fisher, R.W., & Mulligan, B. The validity of a behavioral rating scale: Application of a psychological technique. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1977, 12(3), 357-372.

Seibold, D.R., & McPhee, R.D. A new analysis of Daly's "assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self reports: A comparison of measures." Communication Monographs, 1980, 47(2), 149-152.

Sieburg, E. Interpersonal confirmation: A paradigm for conceptualization and measurement. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, April 1973.

Sieburg, E., & Larson, C. Dimensions of interpersonal response. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Phoenix, Arizona, April 1971.

Snyder, M. Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30(4), 526-537.

Snyder, M. Cognitive, behavioral, and interpersonal consequences of self-monitoring. In P. Pliner, K.R. Blankenstein & I.M. Spigel (Eds.), Advances in the study of communication and affect. New York: Plenum, 1979, 181-201. (a)

Snyder, M. Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology, (Vol. 12). New York: Academic, 1979, 85-128. (b)

Snyder, M. The many me's of the self-monitor. Psychology Today, 1980, 13(10), 33-40, 92.

Snyder, M., & Cantor, N. Thinking about ourselves and others: Self-monitoring and social knowledge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(2), 222-234.

Snyder, M., & Swann, W.B., Jr. When actions reflect attitudes: The politics of impression management. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34(5), 1034-1042.

Snyder, M, & Tanke, E.D. Behavior and attitude: Some people are more consistent than others. Journal of Personality, 1976, 44(3), 501-517.

Spitzberg, B.H. Interpersonal competence and loneliness. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, February 1980.

Spitzberg, B.H. Competence in communicating: A typology, review, critique, and construction of a predictive model. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, California, November 1981. (a)

Spitzberg, B.H. Loneliness and communication apprehension. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 1981. (b)

Spitzberg, B.H. Other-orientation and relational competence. Unpublished paper, submitted to the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver Colorado, (1981). (c)

Spitzberg, B.H. Performance styles, interpersonal communication competence, and communicative outcomes: An empirical examination. Unpublished paper submitted to the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Colorado, (1981). (d)

Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. Self-monitoring and relational competence. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, California, November 1981.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Phelps, L.A. Conversational appropriateness and effectiveness: Validation of a criterion measure of relational competence. Unpublished paper, submitted to the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Colorado, (1981).

Thayer, L. Communication and communication systems. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.

Tucker, R.K., & Chase, L.J. Canonical Correlation. In P.R. Monge & J.N. Capella (Eds.), Multivariate techniques in human communication research. New York: Academic, 1980, 205-228.

Tunnell, G. Intraindividual consistency in personality assessment: The effect of self-monitoring. Journal of Personality, 1980, 48(2), 220-232.

Wilmot, W.W. Dyadic communication (Second ed.). Reading, Massachesetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Zanna, M.P., Olson, J.M., & Fazio, R.H. Attitude-behavior consistency: An individual difference perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38(3), 432-440.

Table 1. Model and Vocabulary of Competence Components and Outcomes

COMPETENCE COMPONENTS	Label
Motivation	
Communication Invovlement	CIN
Interpersonal Communication Apprehension	ICA
Knowledge	
Self-Monitoring	SMN
Skills	
A's Self-Rated Competence (AA)	ASC
B's Self-Rated Competence (BB)	BSC
A's Other-Competence (BA)	AOC
B's Other-Competence (AB)	BOC
A's Relational Competence (AA+BA)	ARC
B's Relational Competence (BB+AB)	BRC
Joint Relational Competence (ARC+BRC)	JRC
Interactive Relational Competence (ARC×BRC)	IRC
Attentiveness	ATT
COMPETENCE OUTCOMES	
Perceived Confirmation	CON
Alter's Perceived Confirmation	ACON
Communication Satisfaction	SAT
Alter's Communication Satisfaction	ASAT
Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness	CAE
Alter's Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness	ACAE

Table 2. Exploratory Derived Oblique Factor Solution for CAE (n=475).

Item Content	Code	Factor I	Factor II
75. Rude/Tactful	App	.3815	.1897
76. Inopportune/Opportune	Eff	.4205	.0807
77. Normal/Abnormal	App	.4505	.2212
78. Correct/Incorrect	App	.4872	.1467
79. Insufficient/Sufficient	Eff	.3339	.3088
80. Beneficial/Adverse	Eff	.6825*	.0291
81. Inadequate/Adequate	Eff	.4284	.3631
82. Tasteful/In Bad Taste	App	.4360	.2141
83. Embarrassing/Not Embarrassing	App	.0218	.4762
84. Awkward/Smooth	App	-.0348	.8334*
85. Legitimate/Illegitimate	App	.5299*	.1871
86. Successful/Unsuccessful	Eff	.3902	.4370
87. Useless/Useful	Eff	.7766*	-.0719
88. Fulfilled/Unfulfilled	Eff	.5799*	.1665
89. In Control/Out of Control	Eff	.2170	.4340
90. Comfortable/Uncomfortable	App	.0787	.7480*
91. Disadvantageous/Advantageous	Eff	.8151*	-.0957
92. Unfavorable/Favorable	Eff	.6344*	.1421
93. Profitable/Unprofitable	Eff	.7709*	-.1409
94. Inefficient/Efficient	Eff	.6109*	.0485
95. Suitable/Unsuitable	App	.7875*	-.0271
96. Effective/Ineffective	Eff	.8185*	-.0425
97. Appropriate/Inappropriate	App	.7325*	.0143
98. Improper/Proper	App	.7532*	-.0098
99. Unseemly/Seemly	App	.7274*	-.0978
100. Unreasonable/Reasonable	App	.7322*	.0191
Eignevalue		11.4234	.8762
Percentage of Variance Explained		92.9000	7.1000
Factor Correlations		1.0000	.7014
			1.0000

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates a primary loading of an item according to the .50/.30 criterion.

Table 3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Models for Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness (n = 475).

Item	1-Factor Model	2-Factor Model		3-Factor Model		
	Eta 1	Eta 1	Eta 2	Eta 1	Eta 2	Eta 3
80	.574	.694	.000	.427	.000	.587
83	.346	.000	.431	.000	.247	.443
84	.512	.000	.601	.000	.462	.633
85	.574	.000	.683	.000	-.012	.675
87	.603	.735	.000	.498	.000	.608
88	.605	.718	.000	.273	.000	.656
90	.559	.000	.650	.000	.502	.695
91	.630	.771	.000	.488	.000	.643
92	.656	.768	.000	.256	.000	.722
93	.574	.693	.000	.313	.000	.603
94	.549	.630	.000	.091	.000	.628
95	.633	.000	.786	.000	-.161	.782
96	.670	.787	.000	.250	.000	.734
97	.642	.000	.777	.000	-.165	.775
98	.638	.000	.779	.000	-.241	.777
100	.642	.000	.779	.000	-.151	.772
Factor Correlations		1.000	.896	1.000	-.030	.000
			1.000		1.000	.000
						1.000
Chi Square Statistics	χ^2 = 580.85	χ^2 = 473.34		χ^2 = 215.82		
	df = 103	df = 103		df = 87		
	p < .000	p < .000		p < .000		
	χ^2/df = 5.64	χ^2/df = 4.60		χ^2/df = 2.48		

Table 4. Correlation Matrix for All Self Competence Variables and Alter Outcomes [2]

	SRC	CIN	ATT	ICA[1]	SMN	SAT	CON	CAE	ASAT	ACON	ACAE	ARAC
RAC	.63**	.15**	.11*	.10*	.02	.76**	.79**	.62**	.40**	.36**	.35**	.46**
SRC		.34**	.31**	.31**	.07	.65**	.65**	.51**	.26**	.21**	.21**	.32**
CIN			.57**	.54**	.05	.23**	.17**	.25**	.06	.03	-.00	.09
ATT				.30**	.19**	.16**	.11*	.21**	.06	.03	.10*	.07
ICA					.22**	.17**	.13**	.18**	.05	-.04	.03	.06
SMN						.02	.04	.09	-.04	-.07	.09	.03
SAT							.71**	.73**	.37**	.34**	.26**	.40**
CON								.54**	.34**	.26**	.27**	.36**
CAE									.26**	.27**	.23**	.35**
ASAT										.71**	.73**	.76**
ACON											.54**	.79**
ACAE												.62**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

[1] Scoring on Interpersonal Communication Apprehension (ICA) was reversed such that higher scores reflect lower apprehension.

[2] Because of the statistical routine used (Pearson Corr, SPSS), each correlation is based on the maximum number of subjects with nonzero scores for that pair of variables. Thus, the number of subjects varies from 330 to 470.

Table 5. Multiple Regression of Competence Components on Communication Satisfaction (n=350).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
SEX	.1322	.0175	.0175	.0405
RAC	.7662	.5871	.5696	.5709*
SRC	.8012	.6420	.1549	.2946*
CIN	.8024	.6439	.0019	.0401
SMN	.8027	.6442	.0004	-.0219
ICA	.8029	.6446	.0004	.0230
ATT	.8029	.6446	.0000	-.0050

* p<.05.

Table 6. Multiple Regression of Competence Components on Perceived Confirmation (n=350).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
SEX	.1734	.0301	.0301	-.0057
RAC	.7763	.6026	.5725	.5352*
SRC	.8186	.6701	.0675	.3718*
ATT	.8210	.6740	.0039	-.0884
CIN	.8213	.6746	.0006	.0504
ICA	.8217	.6752	.0006	-.0337
SMN	.8219	.6755	.0004	.0203

* p<.05.

Table 7. Multiple Regression of Competence Components on Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness (n=350).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
SEX	.1572	.0247	.0247	-.0301
RAC	.6182	.3821	.3574	.5094*
CIN	.6347	.4029	.0247	.0892
SRC	.6419	.4121	.5150	.1217*
SMN	.6436	.4142	.0021	.0393
ICA	.6441	.4148	.0007	.0333
ATT	.6441	.4149	.0001	.0102

* p<.05.

Table 8. Average Percentage Contribution of Rating of Alter-Competence, Interactive Relational Competence, and Joint Relational Competence to Competence Outcomes.

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Average Percentage Contribution
SAT	RAC	.26
	IRC	.16
	JRC	.16
CON	RAC	.32
	IRC	.15
	JRC	.16
CAE	RAC	.18
	IRC	.11
	JRC	.10
ASAT	RAC	.10
	IRC	.24
	JRC	.24
ACON	RAC	.09
	IRC	.23
	JRC	.24
ACAE	RAC	.06
	IRC	.16
	JRC	.15

Table 9. Multiple Regression of Relational Competence Components on Alter's Satisfaction (n=260).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
JRC	.6575	.4323	.4323	.6661*
CIN	.6590	.4343	.0020	-.0456
ICA	.6593	.4346	.0004	.0104
SMN	.6671	.4448	.0102	-.1073
ATT	.6671	.4450	.0002	.0146

* p<.05.

Table 10. Multiple Regression of Relational Competence Components on Alter's Confirmation (n=259).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
JRC	.6472	.4189	.4189	.6857*
CIN	.6612	.4372	.0183	-.0884
SMN	.6711	.4504	.0132	-.0982
ATT	.6711	.4504	.0000	.0060
ICA	.6743	.4546	.0043	-.0804

* p<.05.

Table 11. Multiple Regression of Relational Competence Components on Alter's Conversational Appropriateness and Effectiveness (n=252).

Predictor	R	R^2	R^2chng	beta
JRC	.5477	.2999	.2999	.5535*
CIN	.5503	.3028	.0028	-.1125
ATT	.5578	.3111	.0083	.1100
ICA	.5578	.3111	.0000	.0101
SMN	.5579	.3113	.0002	.0123

* p<.05.

Table 12. Canonical Correlation Between Competence Components and Self Outcomes (n=300).

Root	R_c	R_c^2	Wilks	χ^2	df	p
1	.8742	.7643	.2249	438.74	18	.00
2	.2043	.0417	.9539	13.88	10	.18
3	.0676	.0046	.9954	1.35	4	.85

Canonical Variates

Competence Components	Set One Weights
RAC	-.7196
SRC	-.3717
CIN	-.0464
SMN	-.0066
ATT	.0317
ICA	.0190
Competence Outcomes	
SAT	-.4087
CON	-.5954
CAE	-.1016

Table 13. Canonical Correlation Between Competence Components and Self and Alter Outcomes (n=300).

Root	R_c	R_c^2	Wilks	χ^2	df	p
1	.8785	.7717	.1954	477.61	36	.00
2	.2411	.0581	.8558	45.55	25	.01
3	.2270	.0515	.9086	28.03	16	.03
4	.1732	.0300	.9580	12.56	9	.18
5	.1113	.0124	.9876	3.65	4	.46
6	.0048	.0000	.9999	.01	1	.94

Canonical Variates

Competence Components	Set One Weights	Set Two Weights	Set Three Weights
RAC	.7386	.9148	.1133
SRC	-.3509	.9558	-.3005
CIN	-.0254	.5998	.0365
SMN	-.0078	.0194	.7499
ATT	.0156	-.2865	.6030
ICA	.0136	.0154	-.1413
Competence Outcomes			
SAT	-.4048	.2707	-.4949
ASAT	.0293	.8239	-.5812
CON	.5745	-.0618	-.2584
ACON	-.0317	1.0762	-.3211
CAE	-.0877	.1491	1.0454
ACAE	-.1073	-.6805	.8113